

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Bates for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Mr. Jason Vick. During the interview, Claim 7 was discussed and contrasted with the invention of Winiger. In particular, the packet routing of Winiger and port configuration of Winiger was contrasted with the features as set forth in Claim 7. Furthermore, the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection was discussed and a proposed solution offered.

Accordingly, Claim 7 and 14 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Regarding the art-based rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of Winiger, Applicants respectfully submit that Winiger does not anticipate the claimed invention.

More specifically, Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, . . . a method for allowing a client application to establish, in a client network, a first connection having a first security level, with a first port of a server application hosted in a server machine linked to a server network, in order to send messages addressed to the server machine, said messages passing from the client network to the server network through a network layer (CR) of a gateway machine, comprising creating a second port in the gateway machine; ordering the network layer (CR) of the gateway machine to reroute to the second port any message sent to the first port, addressed to the server machine; listening to the second port to detect a request to establish said first connection and; generating, in the gateway machine, a thread for establishing said first connection when a request to establish said first connection is detected in the second port.

In contrast, and in relation to Fig. 4 of Winiger, a received packet is passed into the source trusted computer system 50 only after it has been determined the packet has satisfied the security protocols of the source trusted computer system. If the packet security classification is not the same or higher . . . then the packet is discarded for further processing. Upon reaching the destination computer system server, the message packet is intercepted by the server kernel . . . the message packet is preferably analyzed at the lowest software level of the OSI stack, insuring that the kernel examines the sub elements of each message packet.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of the port configuration nor the structure present in Winiger to allow the first connection as claimed. Moreover, and in relation to independent Claim 14, the claim specifies that the rerouting of messages from the first connection is done in a way that is transparent for the client application and second connection is also unknown to the client application. This feature is neither taught nor suggested by Winiger.

At least based on these distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit independent Claims 7 and 14 are patentably distinguishable from the Winiger reference. The claims that depend therefrom are also distinguishable based on the above distinctions and the additional feature(s) recited therein.

With all outstanding rejections having been overcome, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No.

50-1165 (T2147-907461) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Edward J. Kondracki
Reg. No. 20,604

Jason H. Vick
Reg. No. 45,285

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
(703) 903-9000
January 6, 2006

JHV:jab
#9289726